

AWARENESS OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS

RESEARCHED FOR

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC INTEREST LAW AND
RESEARCH (NIPILAR)**

BY THE

COMMUNITY AGENCY FOR SOCIAL ENQUIRY

DECEMBER 2000



Published by: The Community Agency for Social Enquiry (C A S E)

PO Box 32882

Braamfontein

2017

Telephone: +27 (11) 403 4204

Fax: +27 (11) 403 1005

e-mail: director@case.org.za

Web site address: <http://www.case.org.za>

© National Institute for Public Interest Law and Research

Researched for: National Institute for Public Interest Law and Research

ISBN:



Ran Greenstein

Piers Pigou

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF FIGURES	I
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODOLOGY	1
<i>Sampling</i>	1
<i>Fieldwork</i>	2
THE BILL OF RIGHTS.....	3
HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS	5
HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS	7
SOUTH AFRICAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION (SAHRC).....	8
COMMISSION ON GENDER EQUALITY (CGE)	9
PUBLIC PROTECTOR	9
CONSTITUTIONAL COURT	10
OTHER INSTITUTIONS	11
ACCESS TO HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS	12
OPINIONS AND ATTITUDES	13
RACISM	13
SOCIO-ECONOMIC RIGHTS	14
LAND REFORM	14
RIGHTS FOR SUSPECTS AND CONVICTS	15
INEQUALITIES AND DEMOCRACY	16
MEDIA CONTROL.....	16
CONCLUSIONS	17

TABLE OF FIGURES

TABLE 1: KNOWLEDGE OF MAIN PURPOSE OF BILL OF RIGHTS, BY PROVINCE.....	3
TABLE 2: KNOWLEDGE OF MAIN PURPOSE OF BILL OF RIGHTS, BY RACE.....	4
TABLE 3: CONTEXT WHERE MOST HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS TAKE PLACE, BY PROVINCE.....	5
TABLE 4: CONTEXT WHERE MOST HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS TAKE PLACE, BY RACE.....	6
TABLE 5: LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE OF HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS, BY RACE.....	7
TABLE 6: LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE OF HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS, BY RACE.....	7
TABLE 7: SUCCESS OF THE SAHRC, BY RACE.....	8
TABLE 8: SUCCESS OF THE CGE, BY RACE.....	9
TABLE 9: SUCCESS OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTOR, BY RACE.....	10
TABLE 10: SUCCESS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT, BY RACE.....	10
TABLE 11: KNOWLEDGE ABOUT INSTITUTIONS AND PROCESSES, BY PROVINCE.....	11
TABLE 12: SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES AND INSTITUTIONS, BY RACE.....	12
TABLE 13: SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES AND INSTITUTIONS, BY PROVINCE.....	12
TABLE 14: OPINIONS ON RIGHTS ISSUES.....	13
TABLE 15: RACISM IS AN IMPORTANT PROBLEM, BY PROVINCE.....	14
TABLE 16: LAND REFORM MUST BE EXPEDITED TO PREVENT VIOLENCE AND DISRUPTION, BY PROVINCE.....	15
TABLE 17: CONSTITUTION PROVIDES TOO MANY RIGHTS TO CRIMINALS, BY PROVINCE.....	15
TABLE 18: SOCIO-ECONOMIC INEQUALITIES UNDERMINE DEMOCRACY, BY PROVINCE.....	16
TABLE 19: SHOULD THERE BE EXTERNAL CONTROL OVER PRINT MEDIA?.....	17

INTRODUCTION

The National Institute for Public Interest Law and Research (NIPILAR) has commissioned the Community Agency for Social Enquiry (C A S E) to design a questionnaire on awareness of human rights and human rights institutions, administer it and report on the findings. This study follows up on surveys on human rights knowledge conducted by NIPILAR in the last few years. However, many of the questions and the methodology used here are different from those used in previous NIPILAR reports, which used advice offices as the basis for sampling and administering the questionnaires. As a result, we cannot compare responses to similar questions across time. It is hoped though, that the findings of this survey will serve as a benchmark to measure change in knowledge of and attitudes towards human rights issues and institutions over time.

The data for this report are derived from a national random sample survey of 2700 respondents conducted in August-September 2000 by the HSRC, covering all the nine provinces of South Africa. The questionnaire covered a range of socio-economic and political issues, and collected detailed demographic information about respondents and their households.

The questions used for the study were designed by C A S E (in consultation with NIPILAR), and were administered as a unified block in the course of the interviews. The questionnaire was administered to all respondents in the language of their choice.

Methodology

Sampling

The sampling frame was based on the 1996 Census data. The country was divided into Enumerator Areas (EAs), each comprising on average 100-125 households and each with an equal chance of being included in the survey. The selection was done to reflect stratification of the sample by province and by area (urban, informal, rural, etc.), to ensure that all segments of the population are represented in the sample. In each of the selected EAs, eight interviews were conducted with household members who were 18 years old and above.

To identify a visiting point, all stands were numerically labelled on the EA maps. Where possible non-residential stands (shops, churches, etc.) were excluded beforehand. The total number of stands within the EA was divided by eight, giving both the starting point (first visiting point) and the interval used to select additional visiting points. By adding the interval to the first visiting point, subsequent stands were identified until the quota was met. Some maps did not indicate non-residential stands, and the fieldworkers substitute these if they were selected.

If the selected stand had more than one independent household, they were labelled numerically in a clockwise direction, starting with the main household. A household was then randomly chosen using the random number grid. At every selected household, members were listed in a

chronological order of age, from the oldest to the youngest. A random number grid was used to select a qualifying respondent from the members of the household.

On certain EA maps stands were marked as 'flats' or 'hostels'. If there were several blocks of flats or hostels in the area, the random number grid was used to choose a particular block. For blocks of flats, a floor was randomly chosen and a questionnaire administered at every n^{th} apartment (depending on the size of the interval). The same procedure was used in hostels. For hostels that did not clearly demarcate rooms, beds were counted as households for the purpose of the survey.

If there were several farms or rural settlements within the boundaries of the EA, the random number grid was used to select a farm. The number of households on the farm was established and the total divided by eight to obtain the sampling interval.

***Fieldwork*¹**

The fieldwork was supervised by the fieldwork manager at C A S E, using a network of provincial supervisors and fieldworkers. Each province had a supervisor responsible for co-ordinating all fieldwork activities in the province and checking back on 10% of the sample. Most of the fieldworkers who worked on the survey were drawn from a database of experienced supervisors and interviewers, many of whom with extensive data collection experience. Fieldworkers were mainly recruited around targeted areas to ensure they shared the same language and cultural orientation with local respondents as much as possible.

Training took place in provincial centres, covering sampling and selection procedures, completion of the questionnaire, content of the questions with particular attention to technical terms and their translation, and interviewing methods. To measure the effectiveness of the training role playing and written exercises were undertaken. Issues regarding translation were discussed in detail to ensure that all interviewers in the provinces understand the language used in the questionnaire and agree on how to translate particular terms into the vernacular.

Once the questionnaires were completed and returned from the provinces, the responses were coded, the data were punched and the results were analysed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

In the report that follows the key findings are presented. Only rounded figures are used in the text and tables, resulting in some cases in total percentages slightly above or below 100%.

¹ The fieldwork for the study was divided between two companies. C A S E took responsibility for the largest provinces (KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng, Eastern Cape, Western Cape and the Northern Province), and another company was responsible for the remaining four provinces. The procedures described here reflect the practice followed by C A S E.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

We began with the Bill of Rights. Respondents were asked for their views on the main purpose of the Bill of Rights. Just under a third of respondents could provide an answer, with 36% of them saying they had never heard of the Bill of Rights and an additional 29% saying that had heard about it, but did not know what its purpose was. This means effectively that almost two-thirds of respondents could not provide an answer to this question.

The most common response among those who could answer the question was the correct answer – to promote and protect the human rights of people in South Africa. Almost three in ten respondents (29%) gave that answer, the majority of whom (20%) said that these rights applied to all residents of South Africa regardless of nationality, and 9% answered that only the rights of South African citizens were protected.

Levels of knowledge varied by province. Whereas only 17% of respondents in the Western Cape said they had not heard of the Bill of Rights, 43% in the Northern Cape, 49% in the Eastern Cape and a high of 53% in the Northern Province gave this answer. In all provinces except for KwaZulu-Natal (where the percentage was 41%), the proportion of respondents who said they had heard of the Bill of Rights but did not know what was its purpose varied between 24% and 32%.

Combining both responses that indicate lack of knowledge of the Bill of Rights shows the high level of lack of awareness in some of the provinces. This is true particularly for the Northern Province (77%), Eastern Cape (76%), Northern Cape (73%) and KwaZulu-Natal (70%).

Province	Protect and promote rights of all in SA	Protect and promote rights of SA citizens	Protect and promote rights (combined)
Eastern Cape	16%	6%	22%
Free State	24%	5%	29%
Gauteng	25%	13%	38%
KwaZulu-Natal	12%	6%	18%
Mpumalanga	18%	14%	32%
Northern Cape	17%	5%	22%
Northern Province	13%	5%	18%
North West	24%	7%	31%
Western Cape	33%	14%	47%
All	20%	9%	29%

Table 1: Knowledge of main purpose of Bill of Rights, by province

Respondents in the Western Cape were most likely to give the correct answer (47% overall, of whom 33% specified it applied to all residents in the country and 14% mentioned only South African citizens), followed by 38% answering correctly in Gauteng (25% and 13% respectively).

The lowest proportion of respondents giving a correct answer was in KwaZulu-Natal and the Northern Province (18% each), followed by Northern and Eastern Cape (22% each).

Older people (aged 51 and above) were most likely to answer that they had not heard of the Bill of Rights (48%). Three-quarters of them had not heard of the Bill of Rights or had heard of it but did not know its purpose, compared to 62% among those aged 50 and below. Respondents in the age group of 35-50 were most likely to give a correct answer (36%, of whom 24% answered that it applied to all regardless of nationality), compared to 28% among the youngest age group, 27% among those aged 25-34 and 20% among older respondents.

Race	Have not heard of Bill	Don't know its purpose	Protect rights of all in SA	Protect rights of SA citizens	Protect rights (combined)
Africans	41%	30%	14%	7%	21%
Coloureds	25%	34%	25%	11%	36%
Indians	28%	25%	22%	19%	41%
Whites	13%	22%	43%	16%	59%
All	36%	29%	20%	9%	29%

Table 2: Knowledge of main purpose of Bill of Rights, by race

Significant racial variations were evident in responses to this question. Africans were most likely to say that they had not heard of the Bill of Rights (41%), followed by Indian (28%), coloured (25%) and white respondents (13%). If we combine the responses of those who had not heard or who had heard but did not know the main purpose of the Bill of Rights, 71% of Africans fell into this combined category, compared to 59% of coloureds, 52% of Indians and 35% of whites.

Whites were the most likely to give the correct answer – promote and protect the rights of people in South Africa – to the question about the purpose of the Bill of Rights (59% overall, of whom 43% said it applied regardless of nationality). This can be compared to 36% of coloureds (of whom 25% said it applied regardless of nationality), 41% of Indians (22% of whom said it applied regardless of nationality) and only 21% of Africans who gave the right answer (14% of whom said it applied regardless of nationality).

Women were more likely than men were to say they had not heard of the Bill of Rights (39% compared to 32%) or that they had heard of it but did not know what its purpose was (31% compared to 28%). Men were more likely to give the correct answer (34%) than women (24%).

Generally the level of knowledge of the Bill of Rights is rather low. If we take into account that people were asked about the main purpose of the Bill of Rights (which is largely given in its title) rather than about its specific provisions, the inevitable conclusion is that a lot more educational work needs to be done. This should include dissemination of general information about it as well as campaigns around the specific provisions it includes.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

When asked in which context and circumstances in their experience human rights were violated the most in South Africa, 39% of respondents could or would not answer the question. The most common response from those who answered, was the workplace (18%). This was followed by relations between white and black people (14%), dealing with government (7%), the rural areas (7%), dealing with the police (5%), at home (5%), and in schools (3%).

Province	Work place	Home	Police	Govern't	Rural areas	Schools	Race relations	Don't know
EC	21%	12%	5%	9%	6%	4%	6%	33%
FS	9%		2%	9%	16%	2%	15%	46%
GT	24%	5%	5%	6%	4%	5%	12%	37%
KZN	18%	3%	5%	8%	6%	4%	14%	42%
MP	19%	2%	9%	7%	8%	4%	23%	27%
NC	14%	1%	2%	11%	7%	2%	19%	40%
NP	11%	9%	4%	6%	3%	1%	9%	56%
NW	14%	4%	4%	9%	8%	3%	22%	34%
WC	23%	2%	5%	1%	15%	2%	16%	33%
All	18%	5%	5%	7%	7%	3%	14%	39%

Table 3: Context where most human rights violations take place, by province²

Respondents in Gauteng and the Western Cape were most likely to mention the workplace as the context where most human rights violations take place (24% and 23% respectively), while respondents in Mpumalanga were the most likely to mention relations between white and black people (23%). They were followed in that by respondents in the North West (22%), the Northern Cape (19%) and Western Cape (16%). Respondents in the Eastern Cape were the most likely to mention the home as the context for rights violations (12%).

Residents of Mpumalanga in particular mentioned dealing with the police (9%) as the context where most violations take place, and dealing with government was mentioned in particular by respondents from the Northern Cape (11%), Eastern Cape and North West (9%). Respondents in the Free State (16%) and Western Cape (15%) mentioned the rural areas as the context in which most human rights violations take place, and schools were mentioned the most in Gauteng (5%).

Generally, no significant variations based on age were found in response to this question, though the younger the respondents were the more likely they were to mention race relations as the context in which violations take place. Only 11% of those aged 51 years and over mentioned these relations, compared to 16% among those aged 18-24. The differences here are small but

² Percentages do not add up to 100% because of 'other' answers.

may indicate that older people take poor race relations for granted while younger respondents are more likely to see them as an anomaly that should be classified as a violation.

Race	Work place	Home	Police	Govern't	Rural areas	Schools	Race relations	Don't know
Africans	18%	5%	5%	7%	7%	3%	13%	41%
Coloureds	24%	2%	4%	3%	15%	4%	15%	32%
Indians	21%	2%	15%	6%	2%	7%	17%	29%
Whites	16%	5%	4%	11%	7%	4%	17%	33%
All	18%	5%	5%	7%	7%	3%	14%	39%

Table 4: Context where most human rights violations take place, by race

Coloured and Indian respondents were more likely to mention the workplace as the context for human rights violations (24% and 21% respectively), compared to their African and white counterparts (18% and 16% respectively). Coloured respondents were most likely to mention the rural areas as a context for violations of human rights (15%), more than double the rate for all other groups. White and Indians respondents were somewhat more likely to mention relations between whites and blacks as the context in which most human rights violations take place (17% each), compared to coloureds (15%) and Africans (13%).

African respondents were most likely to say that they did not know in which context most human rights were violated (41%), compared to coloured (32%), Indian (29%) and white respondents (33%). Overall there were minor differences between men and women respondents, though men were more likely to mention the workplace (21% compared to 16% of women), and women were more likely to say they did not know (42% compared to 35% of men). Interestingly, there were no differences in the proportion of men and women listing home as the context for human rights violations (5%).

Clearly the work place emerged as the main context for violations of human rights followed by race relations. It is possible that the two are related, and issues of employment equity, promotion, working conditions and affirmative action are seen as related to issues of race. The scarcity of jobs in the country (and the fact that it is consistently brought up in surveys as the main social problem in South Africa) may be related as well to the frequent mention of the work place.

As respondents were allowed to choose only one option, the lower percentages mentioning schools or rural areas do not indicate that these areas are relatively free of human rights violations. Rather they reflect respondents' priorities, among which employment occupies a prime place.

HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTIONS

We asked a series of questions regarding key human rights institutions to examine respondents' knowledge of their existence and role. Respondents were asked to list the four main human rights institutions provided for by the South African Constitution.³

Of the four institutions, 46% of respondents mentioned the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), 34% mentioned the Commission on Gender Equality (CGE), 31% mentioned the Constitutional Court, and 25% mentioned the Public Protector. The relatively high profile of the SAHRC may be linked to recent media coverage of the hearings on racism and the media, and the national racism conference organised by the Commission. Given the focus of the questionnaire on human rights it is not surprising that the SAHRC would most readily come to mind, as it is the only institution with the term 'human rights' explicitly in its title.

Levels of knowledge on human rights institutions varied by race, with Indian and white respondents showing higher level of knowledge than did African and coloured respondents.

Race	SAHRC	CGE	Public protector	Constitutional court
Africans	42%	32%	22%	26%
Coloureds	47%	27%	24%	30%
Indians	66%	59%	54%	59%
Whites	64%	42%	38%	51%
All	46%	34%	25%	31%

Table 5: Levels of knowledge of human rights institutions, by race

With regard to all institutions, age played a role as well. While there were minor variations in levels of knowledge among all age groups younger than 50, those aged 51 and above were significantly less likely to have heard about any of the institutions concerned. Men were more likely than women to have heard about all the institutions, including the CGE.

Age	SAHRC	CGE	Public protector	Constitutional court
Younger than 50	50%	36%	28%	34%
51 and above	35%	25%	15%	19%
All	46%	34%	25%	31%

Table 6: Levels of knowledge of human rights institutions, by age

³ We used a strict measure of knowledge, in which respondents were asked to list the institutions, rather than answer whether they had heard of a particular institution listed by the interviewer. It appears though that in some provinces (Mpumalanga and the North West in particular), fieldworkers read out a list of institutions and marked the responses to it. The reported level of knowledge in these provinces may have been inflated as a result, and the overall level of knowledge would have been inflated as well. For this reason no provincial breakdown of the results is provided.

In addition to examining respondents' awareness of the human rights institutions, we asked them whether they knew the main purpose of these institutions, and what they thought of the success of each one of them in promoting human rights in South Africa.⁴ The results serve as another measure of knowledge: what the institutions are doing and how they are performing.

South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC)

With regard to the SAHRC, 60% of respondents answered they had not heard of the Commission or had heard of it but did not know what its purpose was. The correct answer, "to promote, protect and respect human rights" or a variation on it was mentioned by 29% of respondents, 8% gave related answers (to tell people what their human rights are, educate them about human rights, inform about human rights violations). An additional 2% of respondents answered that the Commission's main purpose was to deal with racism and discrimination.

There were notable racial variations in responses, with 66% of Africans and 57% of coloureds saying they had not heard of the SAHRC or did not know what its purpose was. In comparison, 45% of Indians and 34% of whites responded in the same way. The correct answer ("promote, protect and respect human rights") was given by 24% of African, 34% of coloured, 43% of Indian and 48% of white respondents.

Race	Successful	Neither successful nor unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Don't know
Africans	33%	11%	6%	49%
Coloureds	38%	14%	3%	45%
Indians	48%	18%	3%	31%
Whites	33%	22%	13%	33%
All	34%	13%	7%	46%

Table 7: Success of the SAHRC, by race

When asked about the success of the SAHRC in promoting and protecting human rights in South Africa, a large proportion of respondents (46%) said they did not know and an additional 13% said they were neutral (possibly also reflecting lack of knowledge). Of those who answered, there were more positive than negative views among all groups. Indians (48%) and coloureds (38%) were particularly positive, followed by African and white respondents (33% each). Although whites were relatively more negative (13%) than respondents from other groups, they were more likely to be positive and neutral, or to say they did not know, than to express an outright negative view.

⁴ All respondents were asked about how human rights institutions were performing their roles, even those respondents who had not heard about a particular institution. In most cases those who had not heard of an institution answered 'don't know' when asked about its success. In no case did the proportion of respondents giving a definite answer (successful or unsuccessful) exceed the proportion of those who indicated knowledge of the institution.

Commission on Gender Equality (CGE)

Close to two-thirds of respondents (64%), had not heard of the CGE or had heard of it but did not know what its main purpose was. As with the SAHRC, 29% gave the right answer or a variation thereof, “to promote respect and equality between men and women or promote gender equality”, and additional 3% answered that its purpose was to tackle discrimination between men and women. The rest gave obviously wrong answers, such as give women control over men or to discriminate between men and women.

The racial variation in responses was similar to that shown in responses to the question about the SAHRC. Whereas 70% of Africans and 62% of coloureds answered they had not heard of the CGE or did not know what its purpose, 45% of Indian and 38% of white respondents gave those answers. The correct answer (“promote respect and equality between men and women”) was given by 23% of Africans, 27% of coloureds, 48% of Indians and 53% of whites.

Race	Successful	Neither successful nor Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Don't know
Africans	25%	10%	7%	58%
Coloureds	29%	11%	2%	59%
Indians	44%	19%	4%	32%
Whites	27%	23%	12%	38%
All	26%	12%	7%	54%

Table 8: Success of the CGE, by race

When asked to evaluate the Commission’s success in promoting and protecting human rights over half of respondents said they did not know (54%), and an additional 12% said they were neutral (again, likely to reflect lack of knowledge of the Commission). Among all groups the view of the CGE’s success was more positive than negative. As with the SAHRC, Indians were the most positive (44%) and whites the most negative (12%). Remarkably over two-thirds of coloured and African respondents said they did not know to what extent the CGE has fulfilled its mission or that they were neutral in this regard.

Public Protector

Knowledge of the Public Protector office was limited. Three-quarters of respondents (75%) had not heard of it or did not know what its main purpose was. Only 11% knew that its main purpose was to investigate improper conduct in state and public affairs, 4% answered that its purpose was to report on improper conduct and take remedial action, and the rest gave wrong answers.

The racial breakdown shows that 79% of Africans, 74% of coloureds, 56% of Indians and 57% of whites had not heard of the Public Protector office or did not know what its purpose was. Only 8% of Africans, 11% of coloureds, 20% of Indians and 23% of whites gave the correct answer.

Race	Successful	Neither successful nor Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Don't know
Africans	13%	10%	7%	69%
Coloureds	17%	15%	4%	64%
Indians	32%	18%	9%	41%
Whites	19%	20%	15%	46%
All	15%	12%	8%	65%

Table 9: Success of the Public Protector, by race

Given the limited level of knowledge about the office, it is not surprising that almost two-thirds of respondents did not have a view of its success in promoting and protecting human rights (65%), and an additional 12% said they were neutral. Among all groups, though, the view of its success was more positive than negative, with the same racial differences as with the SAHRC and CGE. Indian respondents were the most positive (32%) and whites the most negative (15%).

Constitutional Court

Knowledge of the role of the Constitutional Court also was fairly low, with 69% of respondents saying they had not heard of it or did not know what its main purpose was. The correct answer, “to rule on disputed Constitutional issues” was given by 16% of respondents.

Just over three-quarters (76%) of African respondents said they had not heard of the Court or did not know what its main purpose was, compared to 64% of coloureds, 49% of Indians and 39% of whites. Whereas only 9% of African gave the correct answer (rule on disputed constitutional issues), 20% of coloureds, 26% of Indians and 48% of whites gave the right answer.

Race	Successful	Neither successful nor Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Don't know
Africans	16%	10%	8%	66%
Coloureds	25%	18%	4%	53%
Indians	38%	14%	8%	40%
Whites	33%	21%	14%	32%
All	20%	13%	8%	59%

Table 10: Success of the Constitutional Court, by race

As with the other human rights institutions, the majority of respondents said they did not know whether the institution was successful (59%) or were neutral in this regard (13%). Views of its success were more positive than negative, with Indians again being the most positive (38%) and whites the most negative (14%).

Other institutions

Although not part of the human rights machinery, we asked respondents about their knowledge of the body responsible for managing national, provincial and local elections and for ensuring that elections are free and fair. A majority of 60% gave the right answer (Independent Electoral Commission). Just over half of African respondents (55%), 70% of coloured respondents, 80% of Indian respondents and 77% of white respondents gave these answers.

Knowledge of the IEC was highest in the more urbanised provinces, particularly Gauteng (72%) and the Western Cape (66%), and it was above 50% in all other provinces. This relatively high level of awareness is most likely due to the approach of the local government elections, scheduled for December 2000, and the consequent publicity by and about the IEC.

When asked whether there was a need for a separate Commission that will focus on promoting respect for cultural, religious and linguistic communities, 43% of respondents agreed that there was such a need. Whites and coloureds were the most likely to agree with this notion (54% and 46% respectively), followed by Africans (41%) and Indians (36%).

The highest level of support for such a commission was shown in the Northern Province (54%), Western Cape (53%), Mpumalanga (48%) and KwaZulu-Natal (47%). There seems to be a link between support for the commission and the extent of cultural and linguistic conflict in the provinces but it is not consistent.

When asked about the government's National Action Plan (NAP) for the promotion and protection of human rights, only 9% of respondents said they had heard of it and knew what it was. The majority (75%) had not heard of it, and a further 15% said they had heard of it but did not know what it was. Levels of knowledge were higher among whites and coloureds (14% each), compared to African (8%) and Indian (7%) respondents.

Province	Know IEC is in charge of elections	Support separate cultural commission	Know about the NAP
Eastern Cape	58%	45%	3%
Free State	51%	30%	7%
Gauteng	72%	39%	11%
KwaZulu-Natal	56%	47%	9%
Mpumalanga	58%	48%	14%
Northern Cape	54%	29%	13%
Northern Province	57%	54%	10%
North West	54%	28%	12%
Western Cape	66%	53%	11%
All	60%	43%	9%

Table 11: Knowledge about institutions and processes, by province

Access to human rights institutions

The vast majority of respondents (94%) had never approached a human rights institution directly. Only 7% of Africans, 3% of coloureds, and 2% of whites and Indians said they had approached any of the institutions. When asked how they would make contact with them if they needed to, 59% said they would not know where to go and 13% said they would go directly to the institution. The rest would go to an advice office, a community leader or organisation, a church, political party or a lawyer. Indians and Africans in particular said they would not know where to go (69% and 62% respectively) compared to coloureds (55%) and whites (47%).

High responses indicating lack of knowledge of where to go were evident in provinces with large rural population (71% in KwaZulu-Natal and Northern Province, 62% in the Eastern and Northern Cape). Conversely, respondents who said they would go to the institution itself were most common in the central and urbanised provinces, Western Cape (26%) and Gauteng (20%).

The human rights institutions are not a major source of information about human rights issues, and only 6% of respondents listed them as a source. The most common sources listed were radio (26%), television (20%) and newspapers and magazines (7%). Just over a third of respondents (34%) said they had no source of information on human rights issues and institutions.

Race	Institutions	Radio	Television	Newspapers/ magazines	CBO/NGO/ churches	No source
Africans	6%	30%	13%	5%	6%	39%
Coloureds	2%	14%	45%	7%	4%	25%
Indians	2%	10%	55%	11%	1%	20%
Whites	6%	17%	37%	20%	1%	15%
All	6%	26%	20%	7%	5%	34%

Table 12: Sources of information on human rights issues and institutions, by race

Province	Institutions	Radio	Television	Newspaper/ magazines	CBO/NGO/ churches	No source
Eastern Cape	8%	35%	13%	4%	9%	31%
Free State	6%	22%	13%	9%	9%	40%
Gauteng	5%	19%	29%	11%	3%	31%
KwaZulu-Natal	5%	27%	15%	6%	3%	43%
Mpumalanga	2%	42%	15%	6%	5%	29%
Northern Cape	5%	21%	30%	4%	3%	35%
Northern Province	8%	32%	11%	4%	4%	40%
North West	5%	27%	21%	9%	9%	28%
Western Cape	3%	17%	42%	12%	2%	24%
All	6%	26%	20%	7%	5%	34%

Table 13: Sources of information on human rights issues and institutions, by province

Respondents in the Eastern Cape and Northern Province were most likely to turn to the institutions for information on human rights issues (8%). As could be expected, respondents tended to turn to radio in the more rural provinces, and rely more on television in the Western Cape (42%), Northern Cape (30%), Gauteng (29%) and North West (21%). The Western Cape (12%), Gauteng (11%) and North West (9%) were also most likely to use newspapers and magazines as sources of information on human rights issues and institutions.

While there were no major variations based on age regarding the specific sources of information about human rights, older people were more likely to say they had no source of information (43% among those aged 51 and above, compared to 31% among younger respondents). Similarly, women were more likely to say they had not source of information (38%) compared to men (30%).

OPINIONS AND ATTITUDES

From knowledge of human rights institutions we proceeded to ask respondents about their opinions regarding various rights-related issues. For each statement presented to them they were asked to indicate whether they agreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, or disagreed with it.

	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Don't Know	All
Racism is one of the most important problems in South Africa today	70%	8%	17%	5%	100%
Right to access basic social services should be guaranteed to all	88%	5%	3%	4%	100%
Government must speed up land reform to prevent violence/disruption	67%	15%	7%	11%	100%
The Constitution provides too many protections for suspects and criminals	54%	14%	10%	22%	100%
Social and economic inequalities undermine democracy, and the state must address these inequalities	54%	16%	8%	23%	100%

Table 14: Opinions on rights issues

Racism

Racial differences in responses to these questions were evident but were not as large as could be expected. Whites and Indians were most likely to disagree that racism was one of the most important problems in South Africa (24% and 19% respectively disagreed), yet a majority of them agreed with the statement (64% and 63% respectively), slightly lower than average (70%). Coloureds were more likely to agree with the statement (76%) than Africans respondents (71%).

Province	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know	All
Eastern Cape	55%	1%	39%	5%	100%
Free State	70%	13%	13%	4%	100%
Gauteng	79%	5%	10%	6%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	68%	9%	16%	7%	100%
Mpumalanga	79%	7%	11%	3%	100%
Northern Cape	76%	10%	10%	3%	100%
Northern Province	71%	7%	14%	8%	100%
North West	67%	16%	15%	3%	100%
Western Cape	67%	19%	13%	1%	100%
All	70%	8%	17%	5%	100%

Table 15: Racism is an important problem, by province

Agreement that racism was one of the most important problems in South Africa was highest in Gauteng and Mpumalanga (79% each), the Northern Cape (76%) and the Northern Province (71%), and lowest in the Eastern Cape (55%). The Eastern Cape had the highest level of those who disagreed with the statement (39%), followed by KwaZulu-Natal (16%).

Socio-economic rights

The percentage of whites who disagreed with the notion that socio-economic rights (access to water, housing, education, health and social security) were basic rights that should be guaranteed to all, is more than double the national average (7%). Only 3% of Africans and no coloured and Indian respondents disagreed with the statement. However, the majority of whites support these rights (87%, similar to the African rate and marginally lower than the national average of 88%). The coloured and Indian rate of agreement was even higher (96% and 82% respectively).

Support for socio-economic rights was particularly strong in the Western (96%), Eastern (95%) and Northern (89%) Cape. In none of the provinces were strong disagreements with the statement expressed and the highest level of opposition to it was 6% (in the North West, Free State and Mpumalanga).

Land reform

When asked about land reform and distribution the majority across all groups agreed that it should be speeded up to prevent violence and disruption (though it is unclear what the response would have been like if respondents were not faced with the prospect of violence). This majority was highest among coloured respondents (71%), followed by African and Indian respondents (68% each). The white support for the statement was lower at 57%. Whites were most likely to oppose land reform and distribution (24%), compared to 5% of respondents in all other groups.

Province	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know	All
Eastern Cape	78%	3%	11%	9%	100%
Free State	59%	22%	9%	10%	100%
Gauteng	67%	15%	6%	12%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	71%	14%	4%	11%	100%
Mpumalanga	61%	21%	6%	12%	100%
Northern Cape	60%	19%	9%	13%	100%
Northern Province	65%	15%	9%	13%	100%
North West	44%	27%	14%	15%	100%
Western Cape	76%	13%	3%	8%	100%
All	67%	15%	7%	11%	100%

Table 16: Land reform must be expedited to prevent violence and disruption, by province

Support for land reform was particularly strong in the Eastern Cape (78%), Western Cape (76%) and KwaZulu-Natal (71%). Opposition to the statement was most common in the North West (14%) and Eastern Cape (11%).

Rights for suspects and convicts

White respondents were more likely to agree that the Constitution and Bill of Rights provide too many protections for suspects and convicts (76%). Only 62% of coloureds, 50% of Africans and 44% of Indians supported this notion.

Province	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know	All
Eastern Cape	53%	4%	9%	34%	100%
Free State	48%	21%	11%	21%	100%
Gauteng	53%	10%	14%	23%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	52%	17%	10%	20%	100%
Mpumalanga	42%	25%	8%	25%	100%
Northern Cape	51%	14%	10%	25%	100%
Northern Province	56%	12%	6%	27%	100%
North West	52%	21%	12%	15%	100%
Western Cape	79%	11%	2%	8%	100%
All	54%	14%	10%	22%	100%

Table 17: Constitution provides too many rights to criminals, by province

Agreement that criminals and suspects have too many rights was particularly common in the Western Cape (79%), with all other provinces showing much lower figures (highest among them was the Northern Province with 56%). Disagreement with the statement was strongest in Gauteng (14%), North West (12%) and Free State (11%).

Inequalities and democracy

A small majority of respondents (54%) agreed that socio-economic inequalities undermine democracy in South African and that the state should take steps to address this situation. Surprisingly, African respondents were the least likely to agree with the statement (51%), compared to 65% of coloureds, 62% of Indians and 60% of whites. However, whites were most likely to disagree with the statement (14%), and Africans most likely to say they did not know (27%).

Province	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know	All
Eastern Cape	66%	5%	10%	19%	100%
Free State	34%	26%	13%	27%	100%
Gauteng	59%	13%	6%	22%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	52%	16%	5%	27%	100%
Mpumalanga	44%	20%	9%	27%	100%
Northern Cape	37%	24%	7%	31%	100%
Northern Province	58%	13%	5%	24%	100%
North West	34%	29%	17%	20%	100%
Western Cape	69%	14%	3%	15%	100%
All	54%	16%	8%	23%	100%

Table 18: Socio-economic inequalities undermine democracy, by province

Strong agreement with the statement was expressed in particular the Western Cape (69%) and Eastern Cape (66%). Disagreement was strongest in the North West (17%) and Free State (13%).

Media control

When asked whether they thought that there should be external control over the content of the print media (newspapers and magazines), especially with regards to issues that may involve racial bias, 30% of respondents agreed, 20% disagreed, and the rest said they did not know (41%). Respondents were told that external control referred to control by a body outside the media organisations themselves (such as government, human rights institutions, the courts, etc.

Among African and coloured respondents the proportion of those who agreed was somewhat higher than those who disagreed with the statement, and among Indian and white respondents more disagreed with the statement than agreed to it. In most groups a large proportion did not know what to answer (47% of Africans, 43% of Indians and 37% of coloureds). Only among whites the proportion of 'don't know' answers was relatively low (13%), and a clear majority (59%) disagreed with the statement.

Province	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	All
Eastern Cape	30%	36%	34%	100%
Free State	16%	28%	56%	100%
Gauteng	28%	39%	32%	100%
KwaZulu-Natal	27%	21%	52%	100%
Mpumalanga	26%	20%	54%	100%
Northern Cape	25%	27%	48%	100%
Northern Province	55%	10%	35%	100%
North West	24%	31%	45%	100%
Western Cape	33%	41%	26%	100%
All	30%	29%	41%	100%

Table 19: Should there be external control over print media?

The only province in which strong support for external control over the media was expressed was the Northern Province (54%). In all other provinces the level of support was lower than one-third of respondents. However, in addition to the Northern Province, in KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga more respondents answered in the affirmative than in the negative (though in both cases the majority said they did not know). The strongest opposition to control was shown in the Western Cape (41%), Gauteng (39%) and Eastern Cape (36%). In some of the provinces a high proportion of respondents said they did not know, particularly the Free State (57%), Mpumalanga (54%) and KwaZulu-Natal (52%).

CONCLUSIONS

It the wide range of issues covered in this report makes it difficult to draw overall conclusions. It is clear, though that much educational work need to be done, including dissemination of information about the Bill of Rights, its specific provisions, and other human and socio-economic rights and mechanisms.

With regard to human rights institutions, knowledge of their existence, purpose and activities is limited. Of particular concern here is the fact that the majority of respondents (in the rural areas especially) said they did not know where to turn to if faced with a need to approach a human rights institution.

A campaign to advertise mechanisms and institutions (not limited to those mentioned in the Constitution) dealing with rights violations, and directing people in need to the right place must be put in place. This should be accompanied by an attempt to compile information about the capacity and specific areas of focus of organisations (operating national and at the provincial or local level). This could form the basis for efforts to enhance their capacity and extend their reach so that they could provide services for marginalised communities and individuals that are most in need of such assistance.